

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claims 13, 14, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,625,892).

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. in view of Meyer (U.S. Pat. No. 5,134,777).

Claims 1-8, 12, 13, 19- 21, and 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer.

Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Takahashi et al.

The Office Action in the DETAILED ACTION section is silent about claim 16.

Claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-27 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 14, and 21 being independent claims.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner states that Takahashi et al. anticipate each and every limitation of the claim. Takahashi et al. disclose an eccentric transmission 1 (Abstract, FIG. 1), comprising an imbalance compensation element 11 (col. 6 lines 66-67; FIG. 1); an eccentric element 8a, 8b (FIG. 1; Office Action page 2 item 2 lines 4-6); at least one ball bearing 7 (Id.); an armature shaft 3b having a rotation axis (Id.); an oscillating link 105, 107 (Id.); and a drive shaft 3a (Id.). The ball bearing 7 of Takahashi et al. is coupled to and supports the drive shaft 3a (col. 6 lines 47-49; FIG. 1). Takahashi et al. hint nowhere that the ball bearing 7 is coupled to eccentric element 8a, 8b. Indeed, the disclosure of Takahashi et al. unquestionably shows the ball bearing 7 does not support and is not coupled to

eccentric element 8a, 8b (FIG. 1). Thus, Takahashi et al. fail to disclose at least the limitation of *at least one ball bearing which is coupled to the eccentric element* cited in claim 13.

In Takahashi et al., the ball bearing 7 is coupled to and supports the drive shaft 3a (col. 6 lines 47-49; FIG. 1), and therefore it is conceivable that a center of mass of ball bearing 7 lies on the rotation axis of the drive shaft 3a. However, the both eccentric elements 8a, 8b are always displaced from the rotation axes of the intermediate gear 8 and of the drive shaft 3a (col. 6 lines 53-65; FG. 1). Therefore, a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element 8a, 8b and the ball bearing 7 will not lie on the rotation axis of the drive shaft 3a. Takahashi et al. fail to disclose further the limitation of *a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element (12a – 12e) and the at least one ball bearing lies on the rotation axis* cited in claim 13.

Clearly, independent claim 13 structurally differs from Takahashi et al.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for claim 13 also similarly applies to claim 14 with respect to Takahashi et al.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for claim 13 also similarly applies to claim 21 with respect to Takahashi et al.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Takahashi et al. in view of Meyer render the claim obvious. Takahashi et al., as presented above for claim 13, fail to disclose at least the limitations of *at least one ball bearing which is coupled to the eccentric element*, and of *a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element (12a – 12e) and the at least one ball bearing lies on the rotation axis*, both cited in claim 1.

Meyer discloses an eccentric transmission 10 (Abstract, FIG. 1), comprising an imbalance compensation element 32b (FIG. 1; Office Action, page 4, item 5 lines 4-7); an eccentric element 38 (Id.); at least one ball bearing 34 (Id.); an armature shaft 20 having a rotation axis (Id.); an oscillating link 29-33 (Id.); and a drive shaft 36 (Id.). The ball bearing 34 of Meyer is coupled to drive shaft 36 and drive member 32 (FIG. 1; col. 3 lines 13-15), but obviously not to eccentric element 38 (FIG. 1). Further, Meyer discloses nowhere the limitation that a system comprising eccentric element 38 and ball bearing 34 has a center of mass being on the rotation axis of armature shaft 20. A person having ordinary skill in the art sees no motivation nor benefit for such limitation in the eccentric transmission of Meyer. Meyer, as well as Takahashi et al., fails to disclose at least the limitations of *at least one ball bearing which is coupled to the eccentric element*, and of *a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element (12a – 12e) and the at least one ball bearing lies on the rotation axis*, both cited in claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Takahashi et al.

Clearly, independent claim 1 structurally differs from Takahashi et al., Meyer, or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for claim 1 also similarly applies to claim 21 with respect to Takahashi et al., Meyer, or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Meyer, the above rationale for claim 1 with respect to Takahashi et al. in view of Meyer also similarly applies hereby with respect solely to Meyer.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Meyer, the above rationale for claim 1 with respect to Takahashi et al. in view of Meyer also similarly applies hereby with respect solely to Meyer.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Meyer, the above rationale for claim 1 with respect to Takahashi et al. in view of Meyer also similarly applies hereby with respect solely to Meyer.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-27, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233